



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/368,259	08/03/1999	NAOTAKA KATO	JA9-98-122	5329	
75	590 . 05/04/2004		EXAM	NER	
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.			WOO, ISAAC M		
Intellectual Prop	perty Law				
P.O. Box 969		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Austin, TX 78767-0969			2172	1	
			DATE MAIL ED: 05/04/2004	14	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

			A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	10
Advisory Action	09/368,259	KATO ET AL.	V
, and the second production	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Isaac M Woo	2172	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF Th	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S	n. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C	priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	1.0
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		\ \ \ \ \
10. Other:		ALFORD KINDS PRIMARY EXAM	NED INER
		. •	





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments (filed on 04/23/2004) are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kamezawa does not teach displaying indication of the receipt of a predetermined wake-up packet. However, Kamezawa discloses the display unit (LCD, 11 fig. 3) displays when the signal indicates wake-up operation, see (col. 1, lines 49 58 to col. 2, line 1, col. 4, lines 23-50, col. 6, lines 14-26). Thus, Kamezawa discloses displaying indication of the receipt of a predetermined wake-up packet when delivered over network taught by Schmidt.

Thus, the system of Schmidt and Kamezawa combined art discloses the claimed limitations.